

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 6-7 have been added, leaving claims 1-7 for consideration upon entry of the amendment. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendment and remarks submitted herewith.

The Examiner indicates that the priority documents for this application have not been submitted to the patent office. Please note that the priority documents were submitted to the patent office on November 6, 2001. Applicant encloses herewith a copy of the documents submitted to the patent office, showing our certificate of mailing with the November 6, 2001 date. In addition, Applicant also encloses herewith the return postcard from the patent office, indicating that the priority documents were received by the patent office on December 7, 2001.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsueda et al. (US 5,173,792). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."

Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * * claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1-5 include the following limitation: "n (n is an integer equal to or greater than 2) thin film transistors provided between an element to be driven * * * and a power supply line for supplying power to said element to be driven, for controlling, in accordance with a data signal, power supplied to said element to be driven." Matsueda does not teach or suggest that limitation.

The Examiner asserts that Matsueda teaches the limitations of claim 1 and points to column 8, lines 44-50. However, that description of Matsueda merely describes the following: "More specifically, if it is possible to selectively isolate a portion of the storage capacitance, C_p , as represented by equation (9), then if the i^{th} TFT is extinguished, and the display element is driven by the remaining $N-1$ TFTs, the same voltage as in the case where the display element is driven by N TFTs is equally applicable where the display element is driven by $N-1$ TFTs." There is nothing in this statement that discloses n thin film transistors for supplying power from the power line. Instead, the thin film transistors of Matsueda have their gates connected to the gate line, so as to be operated in accordance with a gate signal to supply a data signal to a liquid

crystal element. Accordingly, Matsueda does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1-5.

Moreover, claims 2-5 each include additional limitations. The Examiner's rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper because the Examiner has not pointed to where in Matsueda those limitations are taught. The Examiner has merely made the statement that those claims are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 1. Because this rejection is based on anticipation, the rejection is only proper if the reference teaches each and every claim element. Thus, because claims 2-5 include additional limitations, those claims cannot be rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection is improper and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Applicant has also added new claims 6 and 7. Those claims describe providing a switching thin film transistor connected to a data line and gate line, an element to be driven, and n thin film transistors provided between the element to be driven and a power supply line, for supplying power to the driven element in accordance with a data signal captured by the switching thin film transistor. Matsueda makes no reference to providing at least two types of TFTs having different functions, or providing a separate power supply line in addition to a data line. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 6 and 7 be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Lisa Bongi

Lisa A. Bongiovi
Registration No. 48,933
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

March 8, 2004